



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,880	09/29/2005	Yasuyuki Kitayama	441P095	8386
42754	7590	10/08/2008	EXAMINER	
Nields & Lemack			CHU, YONG LIANG	
176 E. Main Street				
Suite #5			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Westboro, MA 01581			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,880	KITAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YONG CHU	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/14/2008 and 09/18/2008</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 8 is pending in this application, and is under examination on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 09/18/2008 has been considered. Please refer to Applicant's copy of the PTO-1449 submitted herewith.

Response to Arguments

Argument over the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant's argument over rejection of claim 8 has been fully considered, but is found not persuasive. First, the Examiner's characterization of the holding in the *Pfizer* case is based on MPEP§2143(E) under "Obvious to Try" and Example 1, it states "The court rejected the notion that unpredictability could be equated with nonobviousness here, because there were only a finite number (53) of pharmaceutically acceptable salts to be tested for improved properties". Second, the *Santo* compounds [II]-4, [II]-16, [II]-17, [II]-19 and [II]-25 have the core organic structures read on the instantly claimed core organic structures, and the only difference between the prior art and the instant application is the anions, namely Br⁻, SbF₆⁻, ClO₄⁻ and NO₃⁻ for the *Santo* compounds, and CF₃SO₃⁻ for the instantly claimed compounds. However, the anions including CF₃SO₃⁻ are disclosed in the same Santo reference, and all the anions listed at paragraph [0027] of the Specification are expressly stated as the anions "X" of the instantly claimed core organic structures as the original teaching, and there is no

second reference. Third, the comparative testing data analysis of Examples 8-10 with Comparative Examples 3-4 does not really show unexpected results at all, because they are not direct side-by-side comparison (i.e. Comparative Example 3 has anion F₆P⁻, and Comparative Example 4 has anion B(OH)₃). None of the anions (i.e. F₆P⁻ and B(OH)₃) are disclosed in the cited *Santo* compounds. At last, In response to applicant's argument that the compounds in Examples 8-10 show better stability, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

- Claim 8 is rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Chu whose telephone number is 571-272-5759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 3:30 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph M^Kane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Status information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

/Yong Chu, Ph.D./
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626

/Kamal Saeed, Ph.D./
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626